



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,857	12/28/2000	Takafumi Ito	04329.2492	6075

22852 7590 01/16/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LEE, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 01/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,857

Applicant(s)

ITO, TAKAFUMI

Examiner

JOHN J LEE

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3 - 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 and 3 – 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taivitie et al. (US Patent number 6,133,884) in view of Suga et al. (US Patent number 6,427,065). (column 5, lines 66 – column 6, lines 38 and Fig. 5)

Regarding **claim 1**, Taivitie discloses that an IC card (PCMCIA card (50) in Fig. 5). Taivitie teaches that a radio frequency circuit (antenna module (40) in Fig. 5). Taivitie teaches that a memory (50 (personal computer memory card) in Fig. 5). Taivitie also teaches that a connector (43 in Fig. 5) connected to the radio frequency circuit (radio antenna module (40) in Fig. 5) and attachable to and detachable (Fig. 5) from an antenna module having an antenna (40 in Fig. 5) (column 6, lines 39 – column 7, lines 12 and Fig. 5).

Taivitie does not specifically disclose the limitation “a controller configured to control access to the memory and to control the radio frequency circuit”. However, Suga

discloses the limitation “a controller (210 in Fig. 14) configured to control access to the memory (63 in Fig. 12) and to control the radio frequency circuit (202 in Fig. 14)” (column 15, lines 56 – column 16, lines 10 and Fig. 12, 14 where teaches microcomputer controls the memory for storing data information and controls radio chip for transmitting/receiving data controlling). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Taivitie structure as taught by Suga. The motivation does so would be to improve the responsibility and reliability of the IC card system by controlling circuits in communication system.

Regarding **claim 3**, Taivitie discloses that a second antenna (30 in Fig. 5) connected to the radio frequency circuit (column 5, lines 66 – column 6, lines 60 and Fig. 5).

Regarding **claim 4**, Taivitie does not specifically disclose the limitation “the controller controls the memory so as to store, in a predetermined area of memory, information specifying a destination of connection, and executes the radio interface control on the basis of the information”. However, Suga discloses the limitation “the controller controls the memory so as to store, in a predetermined area of memory, information specifying a destination of connection, and executes the radio interface control on the basis of the information” (column 15, lines 56 – column 16, lines 10 and Fig. 12, 14 where teaches microcomputer controls the memory for storing data information and controls radio chip for transmitting/receiving data controlling). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the Taivitie structure as taught by Suga. The motivation does so would be to improve the responsibility and reliability of the IC card system by controlling circuits in communication system.

Regarding **claim 5**, Taivitie and Suga disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1. Furthermore, Taivitie further discloses that a connector to be connected to an IC card that has a radio interface unit (column 6, lines 39 – column 7, lines 12 and Fig. 5).

Regarding **claim 6**, Taivitie does not specifically disclose the limitation “a radio frequency amplifier that is connected between the antenna and the radio interface unit”. However, Suga discloses the limitation “a radio frequency amplifier (66, 67 in Fig. 12) that is connected between the antenna (69 in Fig. 12 and column 16, lines 11 – 16) and the radio interface unit” (column 13, lines 58 – column 14, lines 4 and Fig. 12, 14). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Taivitie structure as taught by Suga. The motivation does so would be to improve the signal reliability in the IC card system.

Regarding **claim 7**, Taivitie and Suga disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1. Furthermore, Taivitie further discloses that a connector configured to connect the controller to another IC card (80 in Fig. 7) (Fig. 6, 7 and column 7, lines 26 – 44).

Regarding **claim 8**, Taivitie and Suga disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, Taivitie further discloses that an antenna incorporated in a casing (Fig. 5) of the data processing apparatus (Fig. 5 and abstract). Taivitie teaches that a first antenna (40 in Fig. 5) terminal configured to connect the antenna to second antenna

(30 in Fig. 5) terminal incorporated in the IC card when the IC card is inserted in the slot (Fig. 5 and column 5, lines 37 – column 6, lines 60).

Regarding **claim 9**, Taivitie discloses that the antenna is provided in an eject lever to be operated to eject the IC card from the slot (Fig. 5 and column 6, lines 39 – column 7, lines 12).

Regarding **claim 10**, Taivitie discloses that the antenna is provided on a surface of the casing (Fig. 5 and column 6, lines 39 – column 7, lines 12).

Regarding **claim 11**, Taivitie and Suga disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 8.

Regarding **claim 12**, Taivitie and Suga disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 8.

Regarding **claim 13**, Taivitie discloses that the connector is provided on one edge of a casing (Fig. 5 and column 5, lines 66 – column 6, lines 60).

Regarding **claim 14**, Taivitie discloses that a face of a casing of the antenna module is parallel to a major surface of a casing of the IC card when the antenna module is connected to the IC card (Fig. 5 and column 5, lines 66 – column 6, lines 60).

Art Unit: 2684

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wallace et al. (US Patent number 6,295,031) discloses Memory Card Assembly Having an Integral Antenna.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Art Unit: 2684

Or:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5936**.
He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00
pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Nay
Aung Maung**, can be reached on **(703) 308-7745**. Any inquiry of a general nature or
relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist
whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L.
January 8, 2004

John J Lee


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER